

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 11-13, 16-18, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erdogan (US20030112860) in view of Werner (US4384355). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erdogan (US20030112860) and Werner (US4384355) in view of Wynn (US5952914). Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erdogan (US20030112860) and Werner (US4384355) in view of Vaidyanathan et al (US7031669). Claims 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18 and 20 have been amended. Claims 9, 14, and 19 have been canceled.

Formerly objected to claim 9 has been rewritten into independent form as amended claim 8. As acknowledge in the Office Action, the references do not disclose the limitations in claim 8, as amended. Claim 8, as amended, overcomes the rejections above for the reasons stated above.

Given that claims 10-13 depend on and include the limitations of claim 8, claims 10-13 overcome the rejections above for the reasons stated above.

Formerly objected to claim 14 has been rewritten into independent form as amended claim 13. As acknowledge in the Office Action, the references do not disclose the limitations in claim 13, as amended. Claim 13, as amended, overcomes the rejections above for the reasons stated above.

Given that claims 15-17 depend on and include the limitations of claim 13, claims 15-17 overcome the rejections above for the reasons stated above.

Formerly objected to claim 19 has been rewritten into independent form as amended claim 18. As acknowledge in the Office Action, the references do not disclose the limitations in claim 18, as amended. Claim 18, as amended, overcomes the rejections above for the reasons stated above.

Given that claims 20-22 depend on and include the limitations of claim 18, claims 20-22 overcome the rejections above for the reasons stated above.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because it is unknown what the minimum mean square error solution is a solution to and what values are used in the calculation of the mean square error solution. Claim 1 as amended includes similar limitations in formerly objected to claim 9 to help define what the minimum mean square error solution is a solution to and what values are used in the calculation of the mean square error solution. Applicants assert claim 1, as amended, overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection as well as the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for the reasons stated above.

Given that claims 2-7 depend on and include the limitations of claim 1, claims 2-7 overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections above for the reasons stated above.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because it is unknown what the t -M and Wo matrix values refer to. The values of each specific tap thrown into the matrix. W

refers to TEQ taps in the TEQ filter and N already defines an amount of Time Domain Equalizing taps. Thus, each specific tap value can be determined for the TEQ filter. Each specific tap value in total amount of Time Domain Equalizing taps is found in that W set. t refers to taps in the target channel response and M is already defines half the number of samples in a guard period and thus each specific tap value can be determined for the target channel response. Applicants assert claim 6 as further explained overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection as well as the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections and objections have been overcome. Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the application of the doctrine equivalents. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 10-26-07

/Thomas Ferrill/
Thomas S. Ferrill
Reg. No. 42,532
Tel.:(408) 720-8300

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040